



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,707	12/29/2001	Lokman bin Mohamed Hassan	1291.P001US/HCH/mms	7552
35830	7590	10/29/2004	EXAMINER	
LAWRENCE N. GINSBERG 21 SAN ANTONIO NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660-9112			HOLLINGTON, JERMELE M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2829	

DATE MAILED: 10/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/037,707

Applicant(s)

BIN MOHAMED HASSAN,
LOKMAN

Examiner

Jermele M. Hollington

Art Unit

2829

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the sentence "Fig. 1 accompanies the abstract". The examiner will like to suggest deleting the sentence to keep the abstract in one paragraph. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-2, 6-15 and 19-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ramesh et al (6586925).

Regarding claim 1, Ramesh et al disclose [see Fig. 1] a docking system [see Abstract] comprising: a handler plate (device handler plate 10), mountable to said device handler [not shown] and comprising at least one conversion bar (roller assembly 14), each of said at least one conversion bar (14) comprising at least one lateral protrusion (roller bearing 15) and a tester plate (test head plate 12), mountable to said test head [not shown] and comprising at least one slot mount (receiver block assembly 20), each of said at least one slot mount (20) having an escalating slot (combination of cavity 24 and cavity 46), said escalating slot (24 and 46) being laterally oriented for respective linear engagement with said at least one lateral protrusion (15) for said docking [see vertical motion 16].

Regarding claim 2, Ramesh et al disclose [see Fig. 2a and 2b] said escalating slot (24 and 46) comprises a tapered section and a docking section [both are part of cavity 46].

Regarding claim 6, Ramesh et al disclose said tester plate (12) further comprises a cam assembly (combination of pivot linkage assembly 28, sliding block 26), coupled to said at least one slot mount (20), for enabling said respective linear engagement when actuated.

Regarding claim 7, Ramesh et al disclose said cam assembly (26 and 28) comprises at least one actuating cam (combination of insert handle 34 and insert plate 36).

Regarding claim 8, Ramesh et al disclose said cam assembly (26 and 28) comprises at least one coupling rod (y-direction cross link bar 32).

Regarding claim 9, Ramesh et al disclose said cam assembly comprises at least one interconnecting cam (insert plate 36).

Regarding claim 10, Ramesh et al disclose said tester plate (12) further comprises at least one linear guide (x-direction cross link bar 30), said at least one slot mount (20) being respectively coupled with said at least one linear guide (30).

Regarding claim 11, Ramesh et al disclose each of said at least one conversion bar (14) further comprises at least one reference-locating pin (roller assembly 17).

Regarding claim 12, Ramesh et al disclose each of said at least one conversion bar (14) further comprises at least one adjustable screw spacer (roller assembly 17).

Regarding claim 13, Ramesh et al further comprising at least one pre-docking guide pin (roller bearing 15), mountable to at least one predetermined guide pin position of said handler plate (10).

Regarding claim 14, Ramesh et al a docking system [Fig. 1] comprising: a handler plate

(handler plate 10): a tester plate (test head plate 12); and a coupling assembly (combination of roller assembly 14 and receiver block assembly 20) for enabling said docking [see vertical motion 16], said coupling assembly (14 and 20) being associated with said handler plate (10) and said tester plate (12) and comprising: at least one conversion bar (roller assembly 14), each of said at least one conversion bar (14) comprising at least one lateral protrusion (roller bearing 15); at least one slot mount (receiver block assembly 20), each of said at least one slot mount (20) having an escalating slot (combination of cavity 24 and cavity 46) said escalating slot (24 and 46) being laterally oriented for respective linear engagement with said at least one lateral protrusion (15); and a cam assembly (combination of pivot linkage assembly 28, sliding block 26), coupled to said at least one slot mount (20), for enabling said respective linear engagement when actuated.

Regarding claim 15, Ramesh et al disclose [see Fig. 2a and 2b] said escalating slot (24) comprises a tapered section and a docking section [both are part of cavity 46].

Regarding claim 19, Ramesh et al disclose said cam assembly (26 and 28) comprises at least one actuating cam (combination of insert handle 34 and insert plate 36).

Regarding claim 20, Ramesh et al disclose said cam assembly (26 and 28) comprises at least one coupling rod (y-direction cross link bar 32).

Regarding claim 21, Ramesh et al disclose said cam assembly comprises at least one interconnecting cam (insert plate 36).

Regarding claim 22, Ramesh et al disclose said tester plate (12) further comprises at least one linear guide (x-direction cross link bar 30), said at least one slot mount (20) being respectively coupled with said at least one linear guide (30).

Regarding claim 23, Ramesh et al disclose each of said at least one conversion bar (14) further comprises at least one reference-locating pin (roller assembly 17).

Regarding claim 24, Ramesh et al disclose each of said at least one conversion bar (14) further comprises at least one adjustable screw spacer (roller assembly 17).

Regarding claim 25, Ramesh et al further comprising at least one pre-docking guide pin mountable to at least one predetermined guide pin position of said handler plate.

Regarding claim 26, Ramesh et al disclose a method comprising the steps of: aligning a handler plate (handler plate 10) to a tester plate (test head plate 12) using at least one pre-docking guide pin (roller assembly 17), said at least one pre-docking guide pin (17) being mountable to said handler plate (10) and respectively engageable with at least one pin socket (cavity 24), said at least one pin socket (24) being associated with said tester plate (12); and actuating at least one actuating cam (combination of insert handle 34 and insert plate 36) associated with said tester plate (12) to thereby enable respective linear engagement of at least one escalating slot (combination of cavity 24 and cavity 46) of said tester plate (12) with at least one lateral protrusion (roller bearing 15) for said docking, said at least one lateral protrusion (15) being associated with each of at least one conversion bar (roller assembly 14), said at least one conversion bar (14) being mounted to said handler plate (10).

Regarding claim 27, Ramesh et al disclose said aligning step comprises the step of positioning [see x-direction motion 18], respectively, each of said at least one lateral protrusion (15) at an unbounded perimeter portion (top portion of cavity 46 in Fig. 2a) of each of said at least one escalating slot (24 and 46).

Regarding claim 28, Ramesh et al further comprising the step of locking [via insert

Art Unit: 2829

handle 34] said at least one actuating cam (combination of insert handle 34 and insert plate 36) in a locking position.

Regarding claim 29, Ramesh et al further comprising the step of unlocking [via insert handle 34] said at least one actuating cam (combination of insert handle 34 and insert plate 36) from said locking position.

Regarding claim 30, Ramesh et al said unlocking step comprises the step of moving a latch handle (insert handle 34) to thereby release a retaining clip.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3-5 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramesh et al (6586925).

Regarding claims 3 and 16, Ramesh et al disclose said tapered section [part of cavity 46] comprises a linear sloping edge (shown as part of slope of cavity 47). However, they do not disclose a linear non-sloping edge as claimed. It is well known to have a non-slope edge where needed (see MPEP 2144.04 *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966)). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have tapered section of Ramesh et al to be a non-sloping edge since the shape of the edge would

Art Unit: 2829

provide support in a selective manner to each individual user moving the handler plate within the tester plate.

Regarding claims 4 and 17, Ramesh et al disclose said escalating slot (24) comprises an unbounded perimeter portion (top portion of cavity 46).

Regarding claims 5 and 18, Ramesh et al disclose said tapered section (part of cavity 46) further comprises a connecting portion (portion of cavity 46 before cavity slope 47) for enabling substantially linear movement of said at least one lateral protrusion (15) from said unbounded perimeter portion (top portion of cavity) to said linear non-sloping edge [see regarding claims 3 and 16 above].

Conclusion

6. Applicant's arguments filed August 10, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a) The applicant's argue: "Applicant respectfully submits that Ramesh '925 fails to teach or suggest the escalating slot as claimed in the present invention because the claimed escalating slot is fundamentally different form the cavity 24 as disclosed in Ramesh '925."

In response to the above arguments, the claimed language of claim 1 states: "...said escalating slot being laterally oriented for respecting linear engagement with said at least one lateral protrusion for said docking." The examiner disagrees with the applicants and believes that Ramesh '925 does suggest the escalating slot as claimed. First the lateral protrusion in Ramesh '925 is represented as roller bearing 15 shown in Fig. 1a. As shown in Fig. 1a, the roller bearing 15 is inserted into cavity 24 and cavity 46 [shown in Fig. 2a] as shown by vertical motion arrow

Art Unit: 2829

16. Ramesh '925 cavity 24 in combination with cavity 46 is being used as the escalating slot of the claimed. The vertical arrow 16 is used by the examiner to show the linear engagement between the bearing 15 [lateral protrusion] and cavities 24 and 26 [escalating slot]. Further, the cavities 24 and 46 are used for docking the bearing. Figs. 4-6 shows the docking motion of the bearing in the cavities and col. 8, line 61- col. 9, line 42 teaches the docking process for the handler plate 10, which has the bearings, and the tester plate 12, which includes the cavities. Therefore, the examiner believes the Ramesh reference covers the claimed invention and the arguments made above are not persuasive.

b) The applicant's state: "Thus, the docking mechanism disclosed in Ramesh '925 cannot be employed in an automated docking system."

In response to applicant's argument, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., docking system being automatic) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Further, since Ramesh '925 states that the docking system is a Universal Docking System (see Abstract), the examiner believes that the system could be manual or automatic for the mere fact that the word "Universal" means [as stated in Merriam Webster's Collegiate® Dictionary 10th Edition, page 1293 left column] "including or covering all or a whole collectively or distributively without limit or exception." Therefore, the argument is not persuasive.

c) The applicant's state: "While the foregoing discussion has been focused on claim 1, the same arguments apply to the remaining claims (2-30) because all the remaining claims are dependent ones upon claim 1..."

In response to the above statement, the examiner will like to note that not all claims depend from claim 1. Claims 14 and 26 are independent claims where claims 15-25 depend from claim 14 and claims 27-20 depend from claim 26.

Since the examiner has not changed the prior art as shown above, the following is being given.

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jermele M. Hollington whose telephone number is (571) 272-1960. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-4:30 EST) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Tokar can be reached on (517) 272-1812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2829

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jermele M. Hollington
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2829

J.M.H.
JMH

October 20, 2004

David Zarneke
DAVID ZARNEKE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
10/26/04